

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 09:01:34 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 06:22:41 -0600
Message-Id: <950201073406_9959914@aol.com>
From: JosephWP@aol.com
Subject: 6 Meters

Hope this is not too far off topic.

Sometimes we all worry about the fate of amateur radio. Well, last night I had my faith renewed. I had my 6 Meter FM set on and suddenly heard stations from NC and SC breaking the squelch.

I quickly turned on my Heath SB-110, switched the beam over to it, and following a brief warmup, worked a number of stations in NC, SC, GA, FL and VA.

Now I know that we routinely send EMail wizzing about the planet. Just yesterday a very fine person in Japan sent me EMail about a tube identification request I had posted here quite some time ago (thanks again!!!), but there is nothing like the feeling of tuning for a frequency and hitting the mike switch and talking with someone hundreds (thousands) of miles away when the band opens up.

AND doing it all on a vintage rig you can care for yourself (for the most part).

Joseph Pinner +
Lafayette, LA
KC5IJD

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 16:41:54 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 13:33:48 -0600
Message-Id: <9502011949.AA29687@marlin.nosc.mil>
From: ejz@nosc.mil (Edward J. "Ed" Zeranski)
Subject: Re: A Beautiful Warbird

> Date: Tue, 31 Jan 1995 21:13:31 -0600
> Sender: boatanchors@theporch.com
> From: "David L. Stinson" <72227.1640@compuserve.com>
> To: Multiple recipients of list <boatanchors@theporch.com>
> Subject: A Beautiful Warbird
>
> >By the way, they
> > just parked a B-17G at the airfield here in Vegas.
> > I'll be getting pictures of the radio position tomorrow.
> (Bob NA4G:)
> >Is that the Confederate Air Force B-17? I saw it once here but
> >did not get a chance to get inside it. I did get inside the B-24

> >and PBY-5, but they were essentially stripped. If you can get some
> >good shots of the Radio Shack aboard the B-17 and I will pay for
> >a set of them if you can make dupes.
>

Several years ago I got a look at the radio room on
"Sentimental Journey" the CAF B17 and at that time it was set
up with modern avionics. That was about 10? years ago so it
could be changed by now.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 18:40:09 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 15:23:25 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950201163007.6872A-1000000@little-miami.iac.net>
From: Bill Strangfeld <bstrang@iac.net>
Subject: Re: A Beautiful Warbird

> I'm still looking for that unmodified, original B-17 radio room
> that will be the model for my BA shack!
> 73 DE AB5S/7
> Dave Stinson
> Lost Wages, Nevada
>

The US Air Force Museum bookstore up the road in Dayton
sells a nice book of color photos of their Shoo-Shoo Baby B17 that
includes excellent pictures of the radio room, but they're not complete views
of the whole setup.

They also have a book of photos of the interior of a B24 with a very good
overall shot of the original radio gear.

The telephone number of the bookstore is 513-256-6245.

73, Bill Strangfeld WB8YUW

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 23:06:42 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 18:41:28 -0600
Message-Id: <9502020056.AA19417@cybernetics.net>
From: ab4el@cybernetics.net (Stephen Modena)
Subject: A Free List?

Lyndon VE7TCP asked whether "anyone" had considered moving the list
to a "free" site.

I'll make a few comments that are obvious to "old timers" of LISTSERVs
and/or the Internet/ARPAnet/etc....but which may not occur to newer

denizens of this communications sport. :^)

Where could one position a "free" list? Well, the domain address would **not** end with GOV or MIL. Uncle SAM, I believe, would frown.

EDU or its equivalent in non-USA countries: someone at a university, maybe a student or faculty member would request it. Probably this person would be "in" with the computer center, would be himself a system administrator for the university or department...and it would be understood that he would devote time not only to **administering** the elist, but be available on suggestion for "above and beyond duty" from time-to-time as **pay back** for **free** use of the **considerable** facilities it takes to home-base a list like BOATANCHORS with 350-400 subscribers and through-put in the vicinity of 100 MBytes of traffic.

Suppose the domain ended with ORG, i.e. a non-profit organization. Who does we know? arrl.ORG...would they host BOATANCHORS. Well, no. They would tell you up front: too expensive in machines, bandwidth, and personnel time! :^) Just to serve 400 people, rather than the 150,000 ARRL members?

Then there are the COM and NET domains...these are for-profit providers. Somebody has to pay for the use of that for-profit equipment, bandwidth and personnel. Of course, some are IBM.NET...SGI.COM...EXIDE.COM... companies that **incidentally** have Internet connections for furthering their internal and external business operations and plan. Then there are the Compuserve.COM and AOL.COM (America-On-Line) companies that do **not** blush at charging **money** for service...and provide no **administrative** function whatever...so someone is **volunteering** that.

So, to answer Lyndon, the way it happened is that several people interested in the on-going vitality of BOATANCHORS determined by **consensus** that the time had come to foresake the freebie, but badly underperforming no-new-subscriptions-no-unsubscribing-possible-except-once-every-three-months-on-a-limited-basis MIT.EDU. And on a show of hands for who was willing to step-up and put the list server in a **reliable** **stable** place, someone (Jack and Phil) said: "We'll do it."

It could have ended up in British Columbia, but no one in BC said: I have a free EDU facility, have the permission of our university people, and **I** am ready to supply the **skills** and the **immense** amount of time to over see the smooth operation of the list in the thermal thicket of a rapidly changing, over-trafficed Internet environment. :^)

As I said in a posting last week, I was trying to arrange for a

possible shift to Cybernetics (my provider), but they are too busy, kept putting off when the "new mail hub" will be ready and ..and here is the important part...and were unable to quote even a ballpark price for the service. :^)

Succinctly: THERE IS NO FREE LUNCH. :^) SOMEONE always PAYS. :^)
And I've sent my donation to Phil Porch.

--

73/Steve/AB4EL ab4el@Cybernetics.NET in Raleigh, NC 35.81245N, 78.65849W

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 15:49:52 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 12:47:35 -0600
Message-Id: <9502011400.aa24474@FSAC3.PICA.ARMY.MIL>
From: Clark Fishman (FSAC-FCD) <cfishman@fsac3.pica.army.mil>
Subject: Amen

Jim Musgrove is on target...I moded my SX-110 with a new mixer,filter choke, VR tube and silicon rectifiers just to make it work halp decently....I used a top hat power diode as a varactor to fine tune an ARC-5 receiver....Tony, W2EWL gave me matched crystals so I could build my first SSB transmitter...He was onw hell of a radio genius...sit him down in front of some parts and a hot soldering iron....and a radio comes out....

Clark Fishman WA2UNN cfishman@pica.army.mil

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 23:10:10 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 19:03:59 -0600
Message-Id: <199502020120.RAA12756@hobbles.UCSC.EDU>
From: haynes@cats.ucsc.edu (Jim Haynes)
Subject: ARC-21 & ARC-65 (was ART-13)

So does anybody know where the ARC-21 (AM) and ARC-65 (SSB) were used?

From boatanchors@theporch.com Thu Feb 2 00:37:03 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 21:24:40 -0600
Message-Id: <199502020323.VAA19949@uro.theporch.com>
From: Jack Taylor <n7oo@huachuca-emh8.army.mil>
Subject: Re: ARC-21 & ARC-65 (was ART-13)

The AN/ARC-21 was used with B-52 and C-130 aircraft. It was replaced with the AN/ARC-65 which was also aboard C-135 and KC-135's.

73 de Jack

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 23:06:30 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 18:28:15 -0600
Message-Id: <199502020044.TAA18890@espresso.eng.umd.edu>
From: Philip Gwynne McCoy <dgnova@glue.umd.edu>
Subject: ART-13

I think the ART-13 was used on B-17s and DC-3s. They replaced the BC-191. A friend of mine who flew on DC-3s as a radio operator said he used one on that airplane.
P McCoy dgnova@eng.umd.edu

From boatanchors@theporch.com Thu Feb 2 00:46:59 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 21:50:33 -0600
Message-Id: <38302@w5ddl.aara.org>
From: n5off@w5ddl.aara.org
Subject: ART-13 in single engine plane

I just visited the Naval Air Museum in Pensacola where I saw a ART-13 in a single engine plane. I'm not sure of the designation, but it may have been an SB2C Dauntless?? or something like that.

It was a large beefy Navy torpedo plane, with a pilot's cockpit and a large gunner/RO position in the back. Plenty of glass in the back and the rear set was low enough to look into (thus the peek). It had folding wings and a very wide stance taildragger gear (not an Avenger).

I believe ART-13's were also used in some Corsair's.

73 de tom

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 20:50:12 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 17:31:47 -0600
Message-Id: <F21H4545.F21H4609@mail.admin.wisc.edu>
From: TOM.A.ADAMS@mail.admin.wisc.edu
Subject: ART-13; Where used?

to: boatanchors@theporch.com

Hello Ed.

I know for certain that ART-13 got used in B-29, B-50, B-36, and C-97. A good case can be made for it being aboard long range C-54s, and Navy PBY patrol aircraft (under the designation ATC). Conventional wisdom has it that the rig was de rigeaur in anything that had more than two engines (postwar), until it was replaced by the Collins 618 series in the mid '50s. Even after that it continued to soldier on in Reserve / Air National Guard heavies.

Tom, K9TA

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 21:21:38 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 18:24:37 -0600
Message-Id: <9502020039.AA12456@uvs1.orl.mmc.com>
From: padgett@tccslr.dnet.mmc.com (A. Padgett Peterson, P.E. Information Security)
Subject: RE: ART-13; Where used?

So now you need a place to put it ? Wonder if the one and only CX-99
(biggest transport until the C-5 and the one and only) is still
sitting in a Farmer's field outside Kelly in old San Antone.

Warmly,
Padgett

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 23:10:04 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 18:57:06 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.3.05.9502012040.A25115-a1000000@booz.bah.com>
From: k1zat@bah.com
Subject: RE: ART-13; Where used?

Yes it is, right outside of the fence to the active runway.
There was a piece about the restoration of the XC-99
in a recent AF magazine, showed pictures of it where it
had run down to just about nothing, etc. The CLSS unit
at Kelly is taking it on for a project to restore to hone
their skills in fixing things.

jd

On Wed, 1 Feb 1995 padgett@tccslr.dnet.mmc.com wrote:

> So now you need a place to put it ? Wonder if the one and only CX-99
> (biggest transport until the C-5 and the one and only) is still
> sitting in a Farmer's field outside Kelly in old San Antone.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 15:23:45 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 12:16:46 -0600
Message-Id: <9502011831.AA02153@gvlf4-a>
From: edd@vfl.paramax.com
Subject: ART-13s where were they used?

While we're talking about the greatest of all BoatAnchors --- on which plane(s) was the ART-13 used?

Ed Doc

K3LPE

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 17:28:56 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 14:35:46 -0600
Message-Id: <2F300FC9@MSMGATE.TRACOR.COM>
From: "Kasprzyk, Emil" <EFK@eng2.tracor.com>
Subject: RE: ART-13s where were they used?

Last aircraft used on---B-58 bomber, earlier planes B-29, C-124 and others.

>From: boatanchors
To: Multiple recipients of list
Subject: ART-13s where were they used?
Date: Wednesday, February 01, 1995 12:16PM

While we're talking about the greatest of all BoatAnchors --- on which plane(s) was the ART-13 used?

Ed Doc

K3LPE

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 06:28:39 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 03:22:32 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9502010321.B17617-0100000@indy1>
From: "Roberta J. Barmore" <rbarmore@indynet.indy.net>
Subject: Audio Processing for AM?

Hi!

There's been some discussion of processing suitable for AM, and I thought to add some info and opinions.

Many AMers are interested in fidelity as much as "punch," and the sometimes mentioned "model" is the way the audio chain was set up at MW/AM broadcast stations. Reading back through the old magazines &c, and going on my own recollections and experience, there were several different methods used through the years. In approximate historical order, they are:

1. Peak limiting (allowing operation with less "headroom," since the occasional transient peak would be taken care of by the limiter) and manual gain-riding (see below).
2. Very moderate AGC followed by peak limiting.
3. A "windowed" compressor/expander (if levels are within a 10 to 6 dB "window," nothing is done to them; if low or high, they are brought within the window. Time constant is relatively slow), followed by a peak limiter.
4. "Windowed" C/E, followed by a faster AGC of moderately-high ratio, then the limiter. Some attention is given to "absolute" phase and the limiter may incorporate circuitry to cause some asymmetry or at least ensure that any natural asymmetry causes *positive* modulation.
5. "Windowed" C/E, multiband (3 or 4) compression, peak limiter and possibly a hard clipper; usually all in one box. Control of asymmetry, up to at least 125% positive/100% negative.

Recent processors can be even more arcane and exotic, offering things like tilt compensation, multiband limiting, soft clipping, custom transfer characteristic curves, etc.

Of all of the above methods, the one that made the biggest difference was the *first;* and it would have made more if the technology had been up to it. There's not much difference between a "compressor" and a "limiter" other than time constant and threshold; a peak limiter gets the "peak" part from operating in a manner akin to delayed AVC in a receiver--there's a certain threshold at which the plot of input vs output levels changes from a 1:1 slope and becomes (ideally) a flat line--no change in output as the input continues to increase. One sets the threshold to (with an "ideal" limiter) 100% modulation and that's that. In practice, there's some slope after the "knee" (threshold) and it ends up a bit less than right at 100%.

A compressor's transfer characteristic has a gentler in vs out slope--2:1 or 3:1 being typical, and the threshold is set much lower, usually such that room noise is just barely not being pulled up to annoying levels. (One reason why radio studios are so quiet!)

While a limiter can be operated in a "set and forget" manner--and hit pretty hard--such operation is not conducive to fidelity. Having both a level meter (as in the classic Vu meter) on the audio *and* a modulation indicator (in broadcasting, a fast-responding meter plus a "peak flasher;"

for our gear, a 'scope would be better, in trapezoidal rather than envelope display) in your line of sight, and keeping an eye on them and your hand on a mic gain pot ahead of the limiter, at least 'til you've discovered where it should be set, allows much better control of things and better sound quality. It will also tend to "train" you to maintain a fairly constant voice level. (You might end up sounding a little like a radio announcer, though!) *Listening* to your signal (remember simple diode-type "'phone monitors?") is also quite helpful.

A closer approximation to "set and forget" operation can be had by adding a compressor; but you still need to get the input levels somewhere near right, and monitor yourself. The classic effect in which the entire room--creaking chair, yelling kids and the TV set next door--all sound as if they are being sucked into the microphone every time one pauses for an instant should stand as a Dire Example. :)

As far as asymmetry goes, be advised that *adding* any that wasn't there to begin with is indistinguishable from adding harmonic distortion. There is some natural asymmetry in anyone's voice, and by making sure that it ends up in a positive-going direction, you can pick up such benefit as may accrue; mostly, it'll let you set the limiter's threshold closer to 100% negative mod.

The result of all of this is to change the "crest factor" (the peak-to-average ratio) of the modulation, increasing average modulation and perceived loudness. It *can* cook components being run at ICAS ratings, so those ol' California Kilowatt parts *do* have considerable utility in this age of lower carrier power in AM service on the hambands.

Despite the wonderfulness of tubes, a tube VCA or "gain cell," the heart of a compressor or limiter, has some disadvantages. Commercial tube limiters can work all right, though if driven too hard may add some artifacts to the signal--notably, a bit of "thump" at the onset of limiting. Early solid-state gear, perhaps most notably the CBS Labs Volumax and Audimax compressor/limiter pair, is a better choice for those who don't want to spend too much time tinkering and tweaking; late tube gear is next best. Homebrewing of processing is most easily done with more recent technology; there are first-rate VCAs available and the design exercise is considerably more straightforward.

So there's my half a cent (half-sense?), for whatever it's worth.

73,
--Bobbi

Message-Id: <m0rZeHH-00001gC@next3.acme.ist.ucf.edu>
From: clarke@acme.ist.ucf.edu (Thomas Clarke)
Subject: Audio Processing for AM?

I wonder if that ubiquitous audio processor, the Dolby,
would provide any benefit to AM?

There are a couple of old stand alone transistorized (not IC)
Dolby units over at our universities surplus property office now.

Tom Clarke
(Awaiting call letters)

If tube gear is a a boat anchor, can discrete transistor gear
be balloon ballast?

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 14:23:00 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 11:10:41 -0600
Message-Id: <m0rZio7-0004nSC@aupair.cs.athabascau.ca>
From: tech@cs.athabascau.ca (Richard Loken)
Subject: Audio Processing for AM?

Bobbi says:

> Many AMers are interested in fidelity as much as "punch," and the
> sometimes mentioned "model" is the way the audio chain was set up at
> MW/AM broadcast stations. Reading back through the old magazines &c,

And a summary of what Bobbi says is that broadcasters process the hell out of
their signal (and run 125% modulation to boot, at least Canadian AM stations
do...)

Remember, as Bobbi alludes to, broadcaster do their live stuff out of sound
proof and accoustically prepared booths so they don't have to worry about
sending the sound of their crying baby to Texas (unless they want to).

The favourite processors back when I was in the Biz were indeed the CBS
Volumax and Audimax, the names are self explanitory.

Again to paraphrase Bobbi, if you decide to process your signal and crank up
the modulation with carefully planned distortion then monitor, monitor, monitor
and remember your component ratings.

"I make such long transmissions because I'm so interesting..." (ER Jan. 1995)

I make short transmissions, none of my gear was built by Continental.

Richard Loken VE6BSV, Systems Programmer - VMS : "...underneath those

Athabasca University : tuques we wear, our heads
Athabasca, Alberta Canada : are naked!"
** tech@cs.athabascau.ca ** : - Aurthor Black

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 18:13:30 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 15:15:24 -0600
Message-Id: <9502012130.AA11987@pulsar.genrad.com>
From: dcl@genrad.com (Deke C. Lightfoot)
Subject: BC-779

As a new subscriber, I have to admit it is refreshing to read postings which are sane and polite. now for my problem. I have a recently salvaged BC779 which is in dire need of restoring. This unit, and I presume most of them, is protected for use in tropical climates, with a coating which resembles yellowed lacquer. Does anyone know the trick to removing this stuff? It is oversprayed on contacts, terminals, components, short of moving switch contacts.

73, Deke, AA6DF dcl@genrad.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 19:47:13 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 16:42:18 -0600
Message-Id: <9502012258.AA12588@speckle.ncsl.nist.gov>
From: morgan@speckle.ncsl.nist.gov (Roy Morgan)
Subject: Re: BC-779

Does anyone know the trick to removing this
>stuff?

Don't. It's not in any place it should not be in, and it won't hurt anything.

If you do soldering, it'll burn off. If yo have to, find a solvent to remove it, but I'd guess that the solvent will be worse on you than the littlel you'll kickup with your soldering iron.

--
Roy --

Roy Morgan / Tech A-266 / NIST / Gaithersburg MD 20899
(National Institute of Standards and Technology, formerly NBS)
301-975-3254 Fax: 301-948-6213 Internet: morgan@speckle.ncsl.nist.gov

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 23:04:50 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 18:40:54 -0600
Message-Id: <199502020056.TAA19011@espresso.eng.umd.edu>
From: Philip Gwynne McCoy <dgnova@glue.umd.edu>
Subject: Booton160A

If I remember correctly the thermocouple ammeter is one half amp full scale. If thats any help.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 15:26:39 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 12:03:53 -0600
Message-Id: <9502011318.ZM4601@eehp04>
From: "Gregory Raven Redi" <ravengre@eehp04.comm.mot.com>
Subject: Comments on Collecting

Greetings Boatanchorites-

The following letter was sent to me by Jim Musgrove K5BZH in response to some of the articles I had sent to him from the list (he does not have a net connection). Jim found the articles on preservation and collecting quite thought provoking. Jim has written several articles on vintage radio for both Electric Radio and QST. I hope you enjoy his letter as much as I did.

Getting Real

Hi Greg,

These guys arguments and points make for wonderful reading and they certainly provide a lot of food for thought.

One thing most collectors fail, underline fail, to comprehend is that many hams modified equipment to improve its performance and in many cases to make it usable. Everyone has simply been too hung up on the as original bit. Its ok if we are merely preserving vintage equipment. I thought we were into preserving amateur radio.

You and I have both seen many modifications that were poorly implemented and others that indicated the owner probably had a hard time with ohms law. That was not always the case. There was some wonderful modifications to the ARC5 series that should be preserved. I hope these don't get dumped. Examples are the novice modifications, W2EWL's "Cheap and Easy SSB," and double sideband transmitters. Don Stoner's "Novice Q5'er" was a nice conversion of the BC453 for novice use. Man these are part of our history.

The older military equipment did present problems for the modern hamshack of the fifties. You think a BC610 didn't wipe out TV sets across the country? Using it required modifications.

I have noted that few collectors paid any attention to homebrew rigs. If you would care to check, during the first 2 years of the Novice license over 50 percent of their transmitters were homebrew. Typically 6AG7-6L6 rigs or 6AG7-807 rigs. This stuff certainly represents amateur radio very well for the early fifties.

My generation was caught in the transition to sideband during the fifties. I will guarantee that many commercial transmitters such as DX-100's, Viking II's, etc were modified to drive with exciters such as the Central Electronics 10A, 10B, and 20A. This allowed the ham to have plate modulated AM and SSB.

I know of an excellent modification article for the Hallicrafters S-40 receivers. It was written in the early fifties and implement modifications such as a real crystal filter for sharp skirts. The same fellow that wrote the article "Shoes for the 10B" wrote this one much earlier. He's still active on the hambands today.

What do you think the addition of an IF stage with a mechanical filter does for an HRO-50 or HRO-60. A product detector can easily be fabricated and plugged into the NMFM adapter socket. Ruin your HRO? If this is the receiver being used for the station receiver, it certainly improves the hell out of it.

CUL,
Jim Musgrove

--

Regards,
Greg Raven KF5N
egr002@email.mot.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 16:49:07 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 13:45:27 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.SGI.3.90.950201145518.5297C-100000@umbc7.umbc.edu>
From: Bill Robie <robie@umbc.edu>
Subject: Re: Comments on Collecting

I once was trying to make conversation with a western North Carolina farrier (horse shoer), and asked his opinion on some minor matter of debate among the local quarter horse community. He gave me a long look and slowly drawled:

"Dif'rent people sez dif'rent thangs."

I guess that pretty much sums up the preserve/restore/modify issue for BAs, too! :)

Bill Robie

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 19:22:22 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 16:37:10 -0600
Message-Id: <9502012250.AA12043@uvs1.orl.mmc.com>
From: padgett@tccslr.dnet.mmc.com (A. Padgett Peterson, P.E. Information Security)
Subject: Re: Comments on Collecting

Bill rote:

>"Dif'rent people sez dif'rent thangs."

Always liked the line from S&B that went something like "Just how dumb a person sounds depends on where they are when they say it."

Warmly,
Padgett

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 23:08:17 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 18:14:33 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9502011740.A20603-01000000@mm1001.theporch.com>
From: Kevin J Pease <kevin@mm1001.theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Comments on Collecting

Kevin J Pease
WB0JZG Mt Juliet, TN.
mm1001.theporch.com

On Wed, 1 Feb 1995, Gregory Raven Redi wrote:

> Greetings Boatanchorites-

>

> The following letter was sent to me by Jim Musgrove K5BZH in response to some
> of the articles I had sent to him from the list (he does not have a net
> connection). Jim found the articles on preservation and collecting quite
> thought provoking. Jim has written several articles on vintage radio for both
> Electric Radio and QST. I hope you enjoy his letter as much as I did.

>

> Getting Real

> Hi Greg,

>

> These guys arguments and points make for wonderful reading and they certainly
> provide a lot of food for thought.

>

> One thing most collectors fail, underline fail, to comprehend is that many hams
> modified equipment to improve its performance and in many cases to make it

> usable. Everyone has simply been too hung up on the as original bit. Its ok
> if
> we are merely preserving vintage equipment. I thought we were into preserving
> amateur radio.

I whole hartedly agree. One hears the same discussions in the vintage car collector circles. I maintain that the moment that the seal is broken on the shipping carton and power is applied the originality is lost. We either look at the ugly old military transmitter or use it. If we are only gointg to look at it it needs nothing inside.

I personally had an HRO-50 with a product detector plugged into the NB-FM socket. I also comitted a sin because I gutted the worthless crystal filter module and installed mechanical filters operated by the original Crystal selectivity switch. The person wo now owns the radio is a collector and loves to use it. The modifications werre a large improvement over the original parts.

Vintage equipment shouild not have front pannels drilled and casses modified but internal mods that improve the operation are ok. I look for modified radios with things like mechanical filters and stability enhancements since the are usually less expensive and more fun to use. If I am not going to use a piece of equipment I imediately sell it.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 18:06:06 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 14:56:11 -0600
Message-Id: <9502012127.AA108084@csemail.cropsci.ncsu.edu>
From: rdkeys@csemail
Subject: Re: Comments on Collecting --- Revisited

Comments from Jim Musgrove K5BZH --- revisited

Thoughts for discussion, and the taking of a slightly divergent point of view.....

> You and I have both seen many modifications that were poorly implemented and
> others that indicated the owner probably had a hard time with ohms law. That
> was not always the case. There was some wonderful modifications to the ARC5
> series that should be preserved. I hope these don't get dumped. Examples are
> the novice modifications, W2EWL's "Cheap and Easy SSB," and double sideband
> transmitters. Don Stoner's "Novice Q5'er" was a nice conversion of the BC453
> for novice use. Man these are part of our history.

Granted the ol Q5'er and their kin are wonderful pieces of our history.

Basically, these ARC-5 mods are often reasonable. BUT, they date from the days when 28vdc was not commonly available and everyone but everyone was

hell bent on rewiring the filament strings, and trying to key the ARC-5 with obtuse/insane/sometimes rarely reasonable methods.

It is EXTREMELY EASY ---- read EXTREMELY EASY to obtain the 28vdc to run these early rigs, essentially UNMODIFIED in the filament/control areas and the original will work very well in almost all instances.

In the particular case of the ARC-5, I would favor running the RX entirely off the dynamotor supply at 28vdc --- piece of cake! The only receiver mods needed are bringing the leads out to a faceplate for audio/volume/phones as has been accepted practice since time began (but I do keep the original junction box faceplate and make up a new one out of thin sheet aluminum). Since I run CW only with them, I ground the BFO line so it is always on.

In the case of a transmitter, there is no need to rewire the filament and control systems. The only relay that needs any fixing is the antenna changeover relay (easily fixed by merely folding the spring contact around until it makes permanent connection to the binding post and unsoldering and taping back one lead to the relay).

The keying relay under the chassis USUALLY requires a little adjustment (merely by bending the contacts appropriately, SLIGHTLY so that the oscillator stage always keys first [to prevent chirp] and the PA second). Primitive, but highly functional differential keying.

Those are the only mods REQUIRED to put a stock ARC-5 type transmitter on the air. Run power to the back connector by carefully soldering in the leads into the pin receptacles [I really hate doing this unless I have to, and would rather use a transmitter rack if I have one]. If care is used, they can be unsoldered to restore rack mounting capability.

Once in a while, I will add a 1/4 inch phone jack to the lower corner of the front panel, for keying purposes. That is the only cosmetic modification to the chassis that I feel is workable. Some folks are prone to put a S0-239 on the front panel in place of the antenna binding post. I really don't like to do these two mods unless it is not a pristine collectable piece, but is a user piece of lesser grade that one wants to get on the air simply [and without those transmitter racks that are getting hard to find sometimes].

Add 28vdc filament, 150vdc oscillator plate and PA screen (from an external power supply dropping string/divider network), and 250vdc (for 5 watts QRP operation) or 350-500vdc (for QRO operation) and you have one of the finest lil' o' rigs around!

If you can't get on the band because you have a 4.0-5.3 or a 5.3-7.0

transmitter, the original designers at Aircraft Radio Corporation were entirely considerate of future ham use of their equipment, because they left sufficient slop in either direction to squiggle down the 4.0-5.3 or up the 5.3-7.0 transmitters by adjusting the padding condensers in the oscillator and PA sections. Additional padding can easily be fitted if necessary to work the 4.0-5.3 down, but mine did not require it. My suspicion is that there is a similar amount of padding slop in the 2.1-3.0 transmitter to hit the 160 meter band, but I have not tried that, yet.

>

> The older military equipment did present problems for the modern hamshack of
> of the fifties.

Not really in my experiences, to date. But, they did take a little headscratching, sometimes. A few of the WWII and earlier rigs like the TBY and some VHF stuff were real beasts to try to do anything with, and unstable mabel after something was done. Here, you take your pot luck. In my experiences, in the WWII surplus was low HF, it is always usable.

> You think a BC610 didn't wipe out TV sets across the country? Using
> it required modifications.

NOPE. Mine worked just fine and did not generate a lot of Tennessee Valley Indians on 160/80/40. It was a heathen higher up. It did have the unfortunate habit of burning its coil insulation (old early plastic and bakelite that was prone to picking up moisture and frying). When that happened, I had to run it on low power (the tune position of the big front switch) and only got 150 watts or so out of it. Its main problem was that it was so heavy that it quite literally was falling through the floor of a 1910 built house that I was living in at the time --- so it or I had to go --- and guess what went...(:+{f...

I would contend that if you want to put WWII gear or other military gear on the air, make as few modifications as you need to to the gear to make it work. If you fully understand and know how it actually supposed to work, you will find that very few modifications are usually necessary. If you have an ol' pre-cut-up ARC-5 and you wanna modify that to make a pair o' shoes for SSB, then that is fine. But, I heartily suggest that before cutting up any gear or modifying any gear that is in very good to NIB category, think twice before you leap, and make sure you really need to take a soldering iron/drill to it, or maybe just need to re-read the manual to run it correctly.

For most vintage ham gear, if it is pristine, think twice before cutting. If it is already cut up, have fun with the drill/torch/iron!

Enuff said, as always, cuz I need to scoot outta here an get sum grub then fire up de ol' bottleburner agn on the top band tonight. The band has been FB all around this past couple of days, and I have even worked fellas QRP half way across the country on same said band!

73/Bob/NA4G
rdkeys@csemail.cropsci.ncsu.edu

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 01:13:24 1995
Date: Tue, 31 Jan 1995 22:27:13 -0600
Message-Id: <9501312229.aa24349@jackatak.theporch.com>
From: List Admin/Owner BoatAnchor Mail List <listown@jackatak.theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Donations (voluntary) to Cover the Cost

Lyndon (and the entire list)-

> Has anyone considered moving the mailing list to a site that
> doesn't charge?

Evidently we didn't write the message real clearly... the issue here isn't that theporch.com charges for service to the list... it goes far deeper than that.

When Jim Lockwood first fired up the list, in August 1992 it was on a corporate InterNet node on the "left coast"... When Jim left his employer and moved to the "right coast", the list was suddenly cast into limbo, went for a brief time with *NO* list, until Paul Prescott, the second list owner, took over the list and moved it to gnu.ai.mit.edu in the spring on 1993.

Paul was no longer a student at mit, but through some connections he had, he was able to get the list a home on the gnu.ai system... Things went well...for a while. Through absolutely no fault of his own, Paul had to leave the list alone, untended, from about June 1994 until the Elves took it over in December.

During the time the list was at mit.edu, we were always in danger of being cast off or dissolved. When a subscriber by-passed Paul and wrote to the sys admin or postmaster to get a problem solved, it *always* rippled back...*negatively*.

Towards the end of that time, when someone *had* to get off the list because his/her address changed, the list simply BOUNCED back to the list and sender all messages destined for that user. The sys admin at mit.edu simply and matter-of-factly said: "Look. This list is here if it doesn't get in our way, but we have no resources to do *anything* with it. If you bother us, we will dump the list and block any of the subscribers from accessing our system. If you want to move the list,

we will help as much as we can." [As archivist, I can provide the *exact* text of that message if some one is so pedantic as to want it for whatever reason...]

We convened a group of "Elves" to advise on the transition. Several people had already stepped in to provide second-hand access to the list, but none had the time nor financial resources to take over the list, NOR did they have certain access to the 'Net, because all were/are dependent to some extent upon an employer or alma mater.

I have been running a system loose-coupled to the 'Net for several years, and am pretty close to being a Charter Subscriber to the Boatanchor List on "Acid Queen"... That had little to do with my becoming List Owner III. And Phil, upon whose system the list server actually sits, is NOT EVEN A HAM nor is he interested in old tube radios... He is a urologist by day, and Unix Hacker, devoted (passionately) to porting Unix Tools to the Apple A/UX environment.

Both Phil and I own 100% of our hardware, software, and we have both been playing long enough to fix things when they break... we are just a little hard-headed about declaring things broken sometimes! ;^)

We all felt, me, Phil, and the Elves, that privatizing the list and removing any dependence upon the grace of an employer or school would add a measure of stability that could not be found elsewhere.

Now, so far in this venture, in order to manage the 65-100 MEGABYTES *each day* that flow in and out of theporch.com, Phil has had to add 16MB of RAM, and has had to upgrade his SLIP connection from a 28.8K modem to an ISDN link. This move has, in turn, resulted in his MONTHLY bill for InterNet connection to \$200/month.

We are asking each list reader to examine his or her own feelings about the list. If you like what you see, and feel it is of value, and if you enjoy the yarns, the data about our radios, the radio pricing assistance and wish to help us defray some considerable expenses of running the list, then we ask that you make a *donation* guided by your own conscience... and that is all...

Parenthetically, I wonder why someone who finds no redeeming value in reading the list would continue to do so, but I can not answer that question for anyone but myself. This is *NOT* an effort to "make a buck" off the Boatanchor mail list -- rather, it is an attempt to place a *voluntary* band-aid over a gaping wound that gushes money!

And, *someone* must pay for the services on the InterNet. When an employer provides it "free" to the employees, the shareholders want to receive full value for what *THEY* pay for... University systems are

driven by TaxPayer considerations, and when the taxpayers feel they are taken for a ride, support free services for other people *outside* the taxing range, they tend to shut that off... I think we are with the times, not ahead or behind. "Free" access to the Net will become more and more rare, especially as large entities see the potential for turning their own profit. It is already well underway here in the states, and the rest of the world will follow, or fall off... (IMHO)

So, that's the story... the whys, the wherefores, the players, the facts...

Now, if there seems to be considerable interest in discussing this subject, I will happily set up another list for those discussions. Otherwise, PLEASE take this OFF the Boatanchor list and write me *private* email and let the list get back to radios. Been too much admin stuff lately...especially from me! ;^)

--

73

Jack, W4PPT/Mobile (75M SSB 2-letter WAS #1657/#1789 -- both all mobile! ;^)
* - - - BoatAnchor Mailing List Owner - - - *
| Jack GF Hill |Voice: (615) 459-2636| Ham Call: W4PPT |
* P. O. Box 1685 |Modem: (615) 377-5980| Bicycling and SCUBA Diving *
| Brentwood, TN 37024|Fax: (615) 459-0038| Life Member - ARRL |
* listown@jackatak.theporch.com-"Plus ca change, plus c'est la meme chose" *

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 10:56:26 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 08:04:35 -0600

Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950201082623.26243A-100000@access3.digex.net>

From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>

Subject: Re: Fair Radio Sales

Good Morning/Afternoon again!

> My ART-13 from Fair Radio cost me (hold on) \$600 6 months ago. \$200 Fair's
> price and \$400 shipping, customs, charge this and charge that.

GASP! Wow! I could almost bring the stuff to you myself for what that costs, or you could buy it an economy plane ticket. I can visualize an ART-13 sitting on a seat, all buckled in, with its (control) head on one of those little airline pillows, covered with a blanket, and with one of those tags they put on unaccompanied kids. ;^)

I hadn't considered what the customs charges might be for an old relic like that. I recall that duty for electronic gear was around 100% in Germany when I was in the Army back in 1966-67. There was a Heathkit store near Frankfurt that stocked exactly the same things as the US stores, but the difference was that the prices reflected the high duty and

shipping from Benton Harbor. We could buy duty-free and the prices for us were only slightly higher than in the US.

> However, Fair was pretty good, they send me a flyer describing
> international shipping and eventually I asked them to use their own
> shipper which proved to be good. No problems then, except of course the
> cost.

My experience with Fair has been pretty good too. They seem to be nice people. If I were to nitpick, it would be that they seem a bit impatient sometimes. Not returning my fax is one example and they usually leave me the impression that they don't have the time to talk on the phone. I don't begrudge their higher prices since I can imagine what it must cost to maintain their stock. Where else could I have found a new condition GRC-9 on demand at any price?

> The only WW2 German comm equipment available are field telephones.

The only German communications relic I have is a "Mix&G[Nest" field phone, but unfortunately the battery box has a piece broken out of it and the crank handle is broken off. :-(

I would like to have something "exotic" to play with (like Rag's ENIGMA cypher machine). The closest things I've seen around have been US WW2 radios with Russian lettering that were probably a part of Lend-Lease or whatever. Rag is the only source I've seen, but in the first place, I'm not familiar with what was what and the book to find out is \$70. On the surface, the prices he has asked seem high, especially after adding in shipping, but I'm sure his investment is comparable considering what you had to pay for your ART-13. I suppose that "exotic" collecting has to be reserved for "exotic" toy budgets.

> And on the other hand yet, things show up that wouldn't normally in the
> US, such as a pile of 51J4s for about \$50 apiece. I bought a R-388 for \$25
> and a BC-312 for \$40.

Where do they come from? I recall local property disposal when I was in the Army and I also remember our burning a lot of stuff that we had no place to store when DeGaulle withdrew France from NATO. It was heartbreaking to see all that new in the box Collins gear from the warehouses be torched.

Well George, the boatanchors may be scarce and expensive, but I'll bet that you didn't shovel any snow this past week. ;^)

73,

Tony

K4KY0

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 14:22:41 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 10:58:12 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950201115642.4337B-100000@access1.digex.net>
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>
Subject: Fair Radio Sales (oops!)

On Wed, 1 Feb 1995, Thomas Bryan wrote:

> I seem to have missed the thread on this conversation. Who is George
> and where is he located, it sounds like we have a common interest in
> exotic boatanchors.

That's an "Oops!" That was supposed to be an e-mail only to George. All I can figure is that I inadvertently hit my BA address macro out of habit when I addressed the message.

George is SV0KA who frequently posts on the BA list. We had been chatting about our expereinces with Fair Radio and his with collecting boatanchors in Greece.

Sorry about cluttering everybody's mail box.

73,

Tony
K4KY0

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 11:41:51 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 08:39:29 -0600
Message-Id: <9502011447.AA02964@ausable.crd.Ge.Com>
From: mallick@ausable.crd.ge.com (John Mallick)
Subject: Fixing a Boonton 160A Q-meter

A couple of years ago I picked up a Boonton 160A Q-meter from the scrap pile here a work. It didn't work when I got it, but I traced the problem to the thermocouple used to measure RF current and compute the Q. Bypassing the thermocouple made the whole thing come to life, but I can't measure Q (at least directly).

Is there anything (even solid state) I can use to replace this thermocouple and bring my Q meter back to semi-original state. I know that there is a fellow in NJ who has a stock of those things and can fix the meter, but I've heard that it's rather costly.

73, John WA1HNL

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 12:46:16 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 09:37:42 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9502010714.A11193-0100000@netcom5>
From: paul Veltman <veltman@netcom.com>
Subject: Re: Fixing a Boonton 160A Q-meter

> A couple of years ago I picked up a Boonton 160A Q-meter from the
> scrap pile here a work. It didn't work when I got it, but I traced
> the problem to the thermocouple used to measure RF current and compute
> the Q. Bypassing the thermocouple made the whole thing come to life,
> but I can't measure Q (at least directly).

I think that HP bought out Boonton. You might try them.

Paul, WA60KQ

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 18:30:26 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 15:27:01 -0600
Message-Id: <199502012140.0AA29613@news.primenet.com>
From: nx7u@primenet.com (Scott Townley)
Subject: Re: Fixing a Boonton 160A Q-meter

At 09:37 01.02.1995 -0600, paul Veltman wrote:

>> A couple of years ago I picked up a Boonton 160A Q-meter from the
>> scrap pile here a work. It didn't work when I got it, but I traced
>> the problem to the thermocouple used to measure RF current and compute
>> the Q. Bypassing the thermocouple made the whole thing come to life,
>> but I can't measure Q (at least directly).

>

The Q-meter thermocouples are notoriously difficult to find and are the one part that always fails. Unfortunately, I don't know a source--I've always bought extra junkers and scrounged enough thermocouples to keep the stable running.

nx7u@primenet.com
Scott Townley
nx7u@primenet.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 14:11:00 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 10:54:52 -0600
Message-Id: <199502011710.KAA15569@atd.atd.ucar.EDU>
From: owens@stout.atd.ucar.edu (Chip Owens)
Subject: GLASS AUDIO

Hello!

Many thanks for all those who offered opinions on Glass Audio.
The overwhelming majority endorsed it highly. I'm waiting for
my sample copy to come in the mail!

James Owens, NW00
owens@stout.atd.ucar.edu

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 06:54:07 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 04:18:57 -0600
Message-Id: <199502011017.EAA15715@uro.theporch.com>
From: bgraham@tecnet1.jcte.jcs.mil
Subject: Need Manual for Eico 222 VTVM

I'm looking for the manual for an Eico Model 222 VTVM.

Bill
N5LMX/DA1WG

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 18:37:34 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 15:44:35 -0600
Message-Id: <9502012159.AA04901@uxsv01.resd.VF.GE.COM>
From: hbrown@resd.vf.ge.com (Harry H. Brown)
Subject: Nye-Viking MB II Price

What is a Nye-Viking MB II in good condition worth? It functions fine, is not all
scratched up, but it's not mint either.

73, Harry, W3IIT
hbrown@resd.vf.ge.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Thu Feb 2 01:36:15 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 22:50:58 -0600
Message-Id: <9502020504.AA08011@texan.frco.com>
From: bill@texan.frco.com (William Hawkins)
Subject: Paid subscription

All this talk about how Phil Porch is spending lots of money on his
Internet connection leaves me somewhat cool. There's lots of other
things going on there besides BA traffic. However, there is another
way to look at it. I subscribe to several magazines that have some
good articles, but nothing like the quality of what goes through this
group. I would be desolate, unconsolable, and other such stuff if
the list and its traffic went away. I guess that asking for some
unspecified donation keeps the IRS off your back, but I'm not happy
with that. Especially if you start doing pledge drives, ala PBS.

I'm going to treat it like a magazine subscription. I'll send to Phil \$30 a year to keep BA coming to a terminal near me. Jack has asked that we keep this discussion off the list, but I thought that there may be others as troubled as I am by an arbitrary donation.

Please respond directly to me, and I'll summarize the results (as they used to say on that overrun medium called Usenet).

Bill Hawkins

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 01:51:42 1995
Date: Tue, 31 Jan 1995 23:10:11 -0600
Message-Id: <199502010523.AA10158@northshore.ecosoft.com>
From: bruce@shore.net (Bruce Marshall)
Subject: paint for Hallicrafters HA-1 keyer

I have just purchased a Hallicrafters HA-1 keyer to go with my Johnson Ranger (that's another story) and the paint on the cabinet is flaking off in a couple of places. I'd like to repaint it. I'll bet there is someone or some place that sells a can of the original color paint...? Any ideas?

Bruce/WA1G >>>

```
+-----+
| Bruce Marshall          \- \- \          email:  bruce@shore.net |
| Contract Office Furniture |          Tel:    (617) 327-3666 |
| 52 Cornell Street       |          Tel work: (508) 683-5332 |
| Roslindale, MA 02131    |          Fax:    (617) 327-7373 |
|                          |          Amateur Radio:  WA1G      |
|                          |          PacketCluster:  WA1G >WA1G |
+-----+
```

From boatanchors@theporch.com Thu Feb 2 01:18:39 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 22:32:00 -0600
Message-Id: <199502020448.WAA17736@zoom.bga.com>
From: larry wise <lewise@bga.com>
Subject: Pay to See

Just my two cents....

Donations are not the way to go....

Make it a fee list and set a price, x dollars per month, quarter, or year.
Pick a day when it's going pay for play and do it!!

This way we won't have a continual undercurrent of grouching about donations..

Just my two cents....

--

Larry E. Wise lewise@bga.com
Georgetown, Texas KA5T
512-863-5870

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 19:14:40 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 16:21:31 -0600
Message-Id: <9502012236.AA16240@efn.efn.org>
From: genewill@efn.org (Gene Williamson)
Subject: QCWA sells 1936 logbooks

To log transmissions on my nifty new Viking Navigator, I just bought a "NOS" 1936 ARRL Logbook, courtesy of the Quarter Century Wireless Association. QCWA General Manager Jim Walsh, W7LVN advises it's okay to buy one of these even if you're not a QCWA member--and they sure do look neat on the vintage desktop! Here's the deal . . .

QCWA has, with the ARRL's permission, reprinted an exact (including an original paste-up error) duplicate of a circa-1936 Amateur Radio Station Log. (Only difference is that the reprint has a black plastic spiral binding, where the original had a wire spiral.) Remember how we used to log **every** transmission, regardless of outcome? This logbook has a column headed "IF QSO RESULTED:".

Logbooks are available for \$6.00, postpaid, from:

Quarter Century Wireless Association, Inc.
159 E 16th Avenue
Eugene OR 97401-4017
Phone (503) 683-0987
Fax/BBS to 14.4Kbps (503) 683-4181

DISCLAIMER W7LVN reserves the right to stick a no-extra-charge blank QCWA application inside the front cover before he mails your logbook! And no, I don't make **any** money from this. Jim's just now getting on Internet and not yet a BA subscriber. My apologies if I've offended anyone by this "commercial" advertisement--QCWA is a non-profit outfit, and it seems to me that logging QSOs in a logbook like this (I'm going to use my Dad's ca. 1940s fountain pen) just puts the finishing touch on any vintage shack!

73 Gene

Gene A. Williamson / Amateur Radio K7DBV
In A Word / 2160 Fairway Lp / Eugene OR 97401 USA

Voice (503) 683-4164 / Fax (503) 344-3413
Internet: genewill@efn.efn.org

~~

* VbReader 2.02 #NR * . . . Exacerbate obfuscation!

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 18:11:49 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 15:10:24 -0600
Message-Id: <199502012125.QAA11868@unccsun.uncc.edu>
From: Richard E Robinson <rerobins@uncc.edu>
Subject: Re: R-390A users survey results

Has anyone ever seen R390As made by the Remington Co? i have seen one and had it in my possession, having sold it for my cousin at a hamfest. i notice they do not show up on the R390A survey results. Was i dreaming or was I in the R390A Twilight Zone?

Rick Kf4AR

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 03:08:37 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 00:31:29 -0600
Message-Id: <9502010644.AA07780@kahuna.math.hawaii.edu>
From: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: rec.radio.swap

Quiet day on .swap. As a reminder, if you see anything you're interested in please contact the seller listed in the 'From:' line below.
Jeff NH6IL

>From: n2mzh@njo.dec.com (jeff)
National NCX-3 HF XCVR with 250Watts on 20/40/80m SSB/CW
this unit is in good condition with manual. Price: \$250.00/B0

>From: wjoew@aol.com (WJoeW)
I am looking for a Drake R8 for a friend.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 18:34:45 1995
Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 15:35:01 -0600
Message-Id: <511EC520F7E@s1.xetron.com>
From: "Jack Giehl" <JACKG@s1.xetron.com>
Subject: RF-505A

Dear BA enthusiasts,

I just received the Tucker catalog. The RF-505A caught my eye. Anyone have any experience with this receiver? How does it stack up against an R-390A? I realize that tuning the thing is a pain in the a###, but their price is \$495, and that is within my budget.

Thanks,

73,

=====

Jack, WB8BFS

jackg@xetron.com Loveland, Ohio (near Cincinnati)

"Peak the grid, dip the plate, and keep the fire in the wire."

=====

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 04:29:53 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 01:23:43 -0600

Message-Id: <199502010736.BAA22688@zoom.bga.com>

From: Henry van Cleef <vancleef@bga.com>

Subject: RME-44/45 radio questions

I'm sitting here staring at the bottomside of the RME radio I picked up as a parts radio last fall and got working, courtesy of a new power transformer and a choke-input-filter to cut down the higher voltage from the new transformer.

Being lazy, I didn't replace all of the (ugh!) wax paper condensers right away. That was a mistake. Most of them weren't condensing, and a few of them were trying to be resistors. However, after going over all the circuits and cleaning everything up, I wasn't at all happy with the way it was working. A whole evening with a signal generator attached to it showed that something was sour in the coil boxes on band 5. So those coil boxes, bandswitches, etc. are now out of the set and being cleaned up. They were filthy.

Now, to my questions. I have an RME-45 book, dated June '45, which came with the set. I got some positive summer-'45 parts off components. The set is very obviously not a production RME-45. It had a VR-150 in the local oscillator circuit, and a four-position switch with a very fancy noise-limiter circuit. The schematic had the changes marked in pencil, but the wiring for both of these was in the wiring harness, and appears to be factory installation. The tuning dial is silk-screened with the legend "RME 44-45" under the gear cover. Serial number on the chassis is "WF 114." There are several differences between this radio's wiring and the June '45 schematic. I also have the Sams Photofact on the 45, dated 1948, which is closer to what I have, but also not 100% accurate. While somebody did a bunch of

butcher-work on the thing afterward, I think I am looking at factory-original differences in a few areas. I do not have schematics for the RME-45B, so do not know exactly how the VR-150 was wired in those sets. However, in my set, it was simply hung across B+ through a 10K resistor and fed to the L0 plate circuit on the bandswitch---the jumper in the VR tube was not used to kill B+ if the tube was pulled.

1. The Sams schematic shows the antenna coil grid winding wired up so that the returns for bands 2-6 are through the shorting section of the bandswitch and the band 1 coil grid winding, which is connected to the AVC bus. AVC is fed through 10K with a 0.01 mike cap to make the AVC action slow. Sams also shows a 0.01 bypass in the coil box on the AVC end of the grid coils for 2-6. My radio has this second cap, not shown in the 1945 schematic, and it was installed when the set was built. However, my set has the AVC line connected to the grid return of all six antenna coils by a jumper from the bandswitch. Is the Sams wiring correct for later sets? I have found the wires involved, and wiring it as Sams shows would take a bit of work---obvious that the set was never wired per the Sams schematic here. If anyone has a known late 45 or 45B, could you tell me if the set is wired with the 10K AVC resistor and 0.05 mike cap (original is huge) to the front section of the antenna bandswitch and a black jumper to the bottom front lugs of the two coils, or wired with the AVC going to the band 1 antenna coil (black wire at on the chassis floor and probably nothing on the center side terminal of the bandswitch? My set seems very RFI-sensitive in the RF amplifier, and even shorting the antenna terminals together doesn't kill the set from picking up broadcast signals.

2. If anyone has an RME-45B schematic, can you tell me how the VR-150 is wired? Does it feed the oscillator plate only, or is the main RF-IF screen bus tied to the 150 volts as well. My set was wired with a 5500/4500 ohm voltage divider across B+, feeding the screens at about 110 volts, and oinking up 36 ma. of B+. I reworked it to put the screens at 100 volts from the VR-150 circuit. Also, on the 45B, did RME continue to run the RF amplifier tube with full tilt B+ on the plate? My set is straight 45---a 2K resistor in series with the plate winding of the RF->converter coil, and 2K in the screen, both bypassed with .01 mikes. Theory sez that running this tube with around 80 volts on the screen and 150-180 on the plate should make the stage quieter, but maintain plate resistance and gain. Did RME do this? On the 84, they run the same tube at 100 volts on both the plate and screen. Does anyone know where I can get a schematic for a 45B?

Problems I encountered in doing an alignment:

a. Very low Q in the band 5 antenna circuit. All other bands have marked peaks when tweaking the trimmers. When I got the set, someone had soldered a 3-30 pf. ceramic across the trimmer. I pulled this off, and get a peak in the range of the compression mica

alone---no peak with a 12 pf. cap across the regular tweak. The peak I get is very low compared to the other bands.

b. Substantial oscillator pulling when tweaking the band 5 and 6 RF-converter stage. Some signs that the compression micas were leaking current as well---lots of jumps and pops when I tweaked them.

As I said, I've got the coil boxes off, and took them apart. Soaked everything in detergent, flush with hot water. Tons of crud came off the capacitors and metal parts, and having the bandswitch wafers on the bench gave me a chance to clean them up and inspect them. The band 4-5 coils appear to have been dipped in wax, but the band 5-6 coils either had nothing on them originally, or were squirted with some sort of water-soluble coil dope. I haven't decided whether to put them back in with no coating, or to round up some sort of spray coating to seal them. Any ideas? The turns for the tuned windings on band 5 on the RF-converter and oscillator coils have been mechanically shoved apart to lower L. I don't know whether this was done in production to get the thing to track or done after. Oscillator tracking seemed reasonably good.

Dunno if it will work any better when I am done, but at least it looks pretty. And taking the boxes off meant that I was able to replace the original bypass caps in the original locations, which requires soldering to the face of the coil box.

Any comments from RME-45 wizards who have fought front end problems welcome. It's taken a lot of work to get it this far, but I get the feeling that an RME-45 is a radio that is a joy to use, and would like to get it in top shape.

By the way, with the choke input power supply, B+ is down at 260 volts with an 80. Original was 310. I don't see anything that needs the other fifty volts. I was astounded to do a current usage analysis and discover that the original layout would draw about 140 ma. of idling current. I could shove an 83-V in the rectifier socket, or put in an octal and use a 5V4, and get about 300 volts B+, but not sure that would get me anything except heat. As things stand, the set is cool as cucumber, oscillator super-stable, and 1 microvolt of RF at the antenna is enough to give good audio, all the way up to 30 Mhz. plus.

--

Hank van Cleef vancleef@bga.com vancleef@tmn.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 10:42:53 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 07:53:35 -0600
Message-Id: <50A33CD584E@s1.xetron.com>
From: "Jack Giehl" <JACKG@s1.xetron.com>
Subject: Simpson (not OJ) Meter

Dear BA enthusiasts,

First, sorry, I couldn't help myself writing the subject line.

Hank van Cleef (and several others) wrote:

>Take a good look with a magnifying glass to see if you can see
> anything jamming the coil.

Hank, I can see from what you wrote that you have been down the meter repair road many times. Usually, when I get a sticking (almost wrote "stinking") meter, the bearing set screw is just a little bit too tight. Alas, loosening it on this one did not help.

Now the weird part. I started to tighten the bearing set screw, and continued to apply and remove current to the meter waiting for the movement to freeze up (or at least stick slightly), which would indicate that the bearing set screw was too tight. This never happened.

As I continued to tighten the set screw, the shaft of the movement just continued to move ever deeper into the bearing set screw, until a collar on the movement shaft started to rub on the sleeve of the bearing set screw.

Is there a jewel inside the bearing set screw the might have cracked apart? Or did something happen to the shaft of the movement inside of the bearing set screw? I did not want to continue at this point, because the meter still works, just not very reliably.

I made some measurements on the meter. It is smaller than a model 27

73,

=====

Jack, WB8BFS

jackg@xetron.com Loveland, Ohio (near Cincinnati)

"Peak the grid, dip the plate, and keep the fire in the wire."

=====

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 10:39:25 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 08:01:41 -0600

Message-Id: <50A52BF04D8@s1.xetron.com>

From: "Jack Giehl" <JACKG@s1.xetron.com>

Subject: Simpson (not OJ) Meter Part II

Dear BA enthusiasts,

This is a continuation from Part I of the Simpson meter.

I made some measurements on the meter. It is smaller than a model 27. The case measures 2 and 3/8" high and wide. The hole size is 2 and 1/8". I don't know the model number, but if you have a 1 MA Simpson meter of this size, regardless of face or case cosmetics, I am interested.

Sorry for the two part message.

Thanks, Jack

73,

=====

Jack, WB8BFS

jackg@xetron.com Loveland, Ohio (near Cincinnati)

"Peak the grid, dip the plate, and keep the fire in the wire."

=====

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 19:38:21 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 16:44:24 -0600

Message-Id: <CCMAIL.0093373.563356140095032FCCMAIL@EMIS.HAC.COM>

From: "James C Reid" <0093373@ccmail.emis.hac.com>

Subject: Thanks!

To everyone who helped with my Drake questions, thanks a bunch! I now have a set of Drake twins soon to be winging their way from New York to California. If I can ever get my code speed up to snuff, I might be able to participate in Friday Night Fist Fight. At least I've got something decent to listen with. And speaking of listening...now that I have a matched set of Drakes, I will more than likely be selling my plain old R-4. I've got a photocopy manual to go with it. If anyone's interested, e-mail me. Trades or swaps will be considered. Thanks again!!

-Jim 0093373@ccgate.hac.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 04:32:56 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 01:40:57 -0600

Message-Id: <199502010754.BAA23562@zoom.bga.com>

From: Henry van Cleef <vancleef@bga.com>

Subject: Re: Want Simpson Panel Meter

As Kevin J Pease said

>

> Kevin J Pease

> WB0JZG Mt Juliet, TN.

> mm1001.theporch.com

>

> On Tue, 31 Jan 1995, Jack Giehl wrote:

> >

> > I removed the meter from the panel and tried some tests with

> > a battery and a resistor. I got the same results. I took the meter apart

> > and backed out the bearing set screw a half turn or so, but it didn't

> > make any difference.

> >

> You might try blowing the movement out with a can of compressed air.

> Sometimes shavings and other contamination gets between the coil and the

> magnet causing the symptom that you have.

>

Oy vey iz mir! I recoil with horror thinking about blasting away with compressed air in a teeny-tiny watch-like meter movement.

Take a good look with a magnifying glass to see if you can see anything jamming the coil.

I've recently done battle with three or four sticky meters, some 50 microamp size. In each case, some judicious tweaking of the bearing set screw helped a lot. One meter wanted the mounting stud nuts twiddled with---the torque on them seemed to warp the frame a little. If the meter sticks, but tapping the case lightly frees it, some TLC with the bearing screw and maybe the mounting studs and case screws, and general patience, should fix things.

>

--

Hank van Cleef vancleef@bga.com vancleef@tmn.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 10:55:35 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 08:07:35 -0600

Message-Id: <9502011414.AA08884@uvs1.orl.mmc.com>

From: padgett@tccslr.dnet.mmc.com (A. Padgett Peterson, P.E. Information Security)

Subject: Re: Want Simpson Panel Meter

Hank rites:

>Oy vey iz mir! I recoil with horror thinking about blasting away with

>compressed air in a teeny-tiny watch-like meter movement.

My feeling exactly, them things are deli-cat. Have seen the symptoms exhibited by little metal fingers that have become attracted to the magnet and are under the loop. Second it is important if you loosen the bearings to do so equally on both sides. Third in a few cases I have seen the wire loops come unstuck from the meter. If this happens it is not going to work.

Now in exceptional cases when my eyes were better, I occasionally replaced the hairsprings & epoxied loops but that must be a labor of love.

>Take a good look with a magnifying glass to see if you can see anything
>jamming the coil.

Particularly under the loop. Also look to be sure that there is an even gap between the magnet and the coil - this spacing can be set with the bearing screws.

Warmly,
Padgett

From boatanchors@theporch.com Wed Feb 1 11:41:02 1995

Date: Wed, 1 Feb 1995 08:32:50 -0600

Message-Id: <9502011442.AA08995@uvs1.orl.mmc.com>

From: padgett@tccslr.dnet.mmc.com (A. Padgett Peterson, P.E. Information Security)

Subject: Re: Want Simpson Panel Meter

Having seen the follow-on message about being unable to freeze on tightening, it sounds like the shaft has become dislodged from the coil as a result the coil is now "sometimes" moving enough to make contact with the magnet and sticking (electrical continuity is usually through the hairsprings - unlikely that this is affected. Also such failure is usu catastrophic.

Warmly,
Padgett